

REMARKS

Claims 1-34 are all the claims pending in the application.

Claims 1-3, 5,6 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,957,075 B1 ("Iverson"). Claims 4, 8-16,18-21 and 23-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Iverson and U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0105543 ("Dong"). Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Iverson and U.S. Patent No. 7,095,456 B2 ("Nakajima"). Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Iverson, Dong, and Nakajima. Applicant submits the following in traversal.

In the Office Action, the Examiner continues to reject claim 1 as being anticipated by Iverson. Applicant respectfully maintains that claim 1 is patentable because Iverson fails to teach each and every element of the claim. Specifically, Applicant respectfully submits that Iverson fails to disclose a UI support module wherein the stored input/output modules are selected corresponding to conditions of respective users, as recited in claim 1.

Iverson discloses an electronic appliance 100 which dynamically selects one of a number of interfaces depending on the current location of the electronic appliance 100. Alternatively, a user may override the dynamically selected interface and select a interface. Therefore, Iverson discloses interfaces corresponding to a single user and does not disclose interfaces corresponding to multiple users. In contrast, claim 1 recites that the stored input/output modules are selected corresponding to conditions of respective users.

In addition, Applicant submits that Iverson fails to disclose the claimed conditions of respective users. Applicant submits that Iverson discloses that a user can select an alternate personality. In other words, the user in Iverson directly chooses a personality.

This is entirely different from claim 1 which does not recite that the user chooses a specific input/output module, but, rather, recites that the stored input/output modules are selected corresponding to conditions of respective users.

Applicant submits that the remaining independent claims 8, 13, 22, 28 and 30 are patentable for reasons similar to those submitted for claim 1, and their dependent claims are patentable at least by virtue of their dependencies.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/ S. Stuart Lee /

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

S. Stuart Lee
Registration No. 61,124

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: January 29, 2008